



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Miscellanea Anthropologica.

The Memoirs of the Anthropological Society.—An article appeared in the December number of our contemporary the *Ethnological Journal*, purporting to give a review of the Memoirs of the Anthropological Society of London. We desire to refrain from expressing any opinions on such a performance. Mr. E. Sellon, the author of one of the papers published in this volume of *Memoirs*, writes to us thus:—"The attack is so much more in the spirit of a Calvinistic preacher and Puritan, than either a scientific man or a polite scholar, and betrays such a profound ignorance of the subject under review, that it would be lost labour for me to endeavour to dispel the mephitic vapours of intolerant cant, prejudice, and conventionalism displayed in that article."

Mr. W. T. Pritchard also writes:—

"Referring especially to the comments upon my own papers, let me point out certain misrepresentations the reviewer has made, and certain 'delusions' he has advanced.

"He remarks, respecting my first paper, that 'it is the result of fifteen years residence in what is popularly called the *Fiji group* of the South Seas; but it gives also an account of the two nearest groups to *them*—the Tongan Islands, and the Samoan Islands.' Now, if the reviewer had read carefully, he would have seen it clearly stated that I simply collate the results of my personal observations while *residing amongst the islanders of the Pacific*, not in the Fiji group only, during a period of fifteen years. I wrote of groups where I have personally resided, whose people, languages, manners, and customs, I know intimately; and I refrained from offering a mere compilation from the observations of others, or giving stories collected during only a passing visit at other groups.

"The reviewer observes that, 'so long as I confine myself to what I have seen with my own eyes, I am both graphic and accurate.' I thank him for his testimony; but, to know whether it is worth anything, I would ask, has he himself visited the islands? If not, how comes he to *know* the description is 'accurate', and to be able to give so decided a testimony on the subject? That it is 'accurate' I know, and those know who *have visited* the islands. But, judging from the reviewer's subsequent intimation, that only a 'few words' of the Malayan have 'been detected in their languages', I am led to suspect he writes on the subject without any competent knowledge of the South Sea Islanders.

"On the subject of the *origin* of the islanders in question, the reviewer seems, indeed, wholly at sea. I beg him to read my paper again more carefully, and to note that I merely *state* my opinion of their origin, and then relate certain traditions and facts. But whether or not it be a 'delusion to trace the fairer races of the Polynesian Islands to the Malays, on the slender evidence of a few words having been detected in their languages', as the reviewer voluntarily alleges,

let me call in the authority of one whose opinion will certainly carry as much weight as that of the reviewer. Mr. Crawford, in his *Indian Archipelago*, says, 'Interesting hints are supplied to us from the collation of language.' In vol. ii, page 78, speaking of the 'great Polynesian language,' he distinctly says it is a 'language which extends its influence from Madagascar to New Guinea and the *South Sea Islands*,' quoting at page 90 from the *Tongan dialect* (amongst others), to prove his position. And then at page 93, he adds, 'The Polynesian language can be traced only as it is scattered over a thousand living dialects.'

"It happens, however, that the example instanced by Mr. Crawford is mis-spelt by him, and does not mean in the Tongan dialect what he states it does. He gives the words *wulu* or *bulu* as the Tongan for *hair*. The letter *w* does not even exist in Tongan; and *bulu* is a *gum* used for caulking canoes; it is also the *husk of the cocoa-nut*. In Tonga, *ulu* is the *head*, as totally distinct from the *hair*. And in this sense, *ulu* becomes the root of many composite words, e. g., *ulu-ua*, *uluhina*, *ulufi*, &c., &c. In all these instances the idea is of the *head altogether*, as distinct from the *hair alone*. The word for *hair* is *lou-ulu*, and conveys the idea of the *hair of the head only*, as quite distinct from the head (*ulu*). For hair on any other part of the body, the word is *fulufulu*; by adding *buaka*, or *moa*, &c., it comes to mean the *hairs of a pig*, or the *feathers of a fowl*, &c. In Samoan, the head is *ulu*; hair of the head, *lau ulu*; hair on any other part of the body, *fulu* or *fulufulu*; on one particular part, *fugu* (=fungu).

"In Tahitian, *uru* is limited to the *skull only* (as also *apuroro*); *upoo*, the head (as *ulu* in Tongan and Samoan); *rouru*, the hair of the head; *huruhuru*, the hair of any other part of the body (also *hete-hete*). In each dialect the word for hair of the body, as distinct from the hair of the head, comes to mean the hair of any other animal, or the feathers of fowls, by the addition of the name of the animal or fowl. In Fijian, the head is *ulu*, or *uluna*; the hair of the head, *drau-ni-uluna* (literally *leaves of the head*); the hair on any other part of the body, *celua* (=thelua); hair on one particular part, *vulua*; the hair of any animal other than man, *vitika*, or *vitika-ni-manumanu*; and when applied to birds, this also means feathers.

"Mr. Crawford gives *bulu* as the Malayan for *hair*. I should like to compare notes with him on this word, as well as on others which may occur in the East and in the Pacific, and trace them out together. Why the origin of the 'fairer races of Polynesia' is still so obscure, is simply because men (like our reviewer) who know nothing of the subject, write nonsense, while those whose knowledge, if brought together, would elucidate the question, keep their knowledge for the most part to themselves. This is to be regretted.

"I must, therefore, take exception to the reviewer's 'dogmatism,' as well as to his delusion, to say nothing of his grammar. And, supported by the great authority quoted above, not to name Pickering and others, I think I may safely apply his own words to himself, and tell him that 'he blunders like a mere innocent' when he says 'The truth is, there is no more ground for ascribing a foreign origin to the inhabitants of the isles of the Pacific than to the black swans of Australia.' I am

almost inclined to think, since the 'delusion' is so 'dogmatically' thrust into his comments, that 'the truth is, the reviewer took occasion of my paper to make a hit at Mr. Crawford's opinions rather than at mine,' as it is Mr. Crawford who uses the 'slender evidence,' impugned.

Professor Phillips and the British Association.—We have received a communication from Professor Phillips requesting us to insert the word "council" for the word "officer" in the report of his speech at the general committee of the British Association (see vol. iii, p. 361, line 24th from top.)

We have much pleasure in calling attention to this wish of Professor Phillips, as it removes the inconsistency of which we complained and to which we called attention: that gentleman not being at the time an "officer" of the Association. The paragraph will now read that the privilege of introducing a motion affecting all future legislation without giving the least notice of such intention, "had never yet been denied to the council of the Association." We regret to perceive that this correction does not at all lessen the inexpediency (to use no stronger expression) of such legislation. We trust that Professor Phillips will see the expediency of withdrawing the resolution so hurriedly passed last year, and allow the British Association to be governed, as heretofore, by the General Committee.

We understand that the following are the contemplated arrangements for the reading of papers before the Anthropological Society of London during the next quarter.

On January 16th, J. Meyer Harris, Esq., "On the Gallinas, a tribe of Sierra Leone," and G. W. Marshall, Esq., LL.M., "On Genealogy in its relation with Anthropology." On February 6th, H. J. C. Beavan, Esq., Hon. Sec. A.S.L., "Notes on the People inhabiting Spain;" Hyde Clarke, Esq., LL.D., "On Moravian Wallachia," and "Observations on the Materials for Anthropology at Smyrna." On February 20th, L. O. Pike, Esq., M.A., "On the Psychical Characteristics of the English People." On March 6th, W. H. Wesley, Esq., "On the Iconography of the Skull;" A. Higgins, Esq., "On the Orthographic Delineation of the Skull;" C. Carter Blake, Esq., "On a Skull from Louth," and Dr. Paul Broca, "On a New Goniometer." On March 20th, George Petrie, Esq., "On the Pre-historic Antiquities of Orkney," and Joseph Anderson, Esq., "Report on the Ancient Remains of Caithness."

The anniversary of the Anthropological Society will be held on Tuesday, January 2, at four o'clock. Afterwards, the Fellows of the Society and their friends will celebrate their third anniversary by dining together at St. James's Hall.

The Anthropological Society of Madrid held its first ordinary meeting on Sunday, the 17th of December last. The outbreak of cholera prevented their meeting before; all the schools and societies being closed by order of the Government. This Society already numbers three hundred members. In our next issue we shall give an account

of the papers read before this Society. Don Matias Serrano is the president, D. S. Castro the vice-president, and Don F. Delgado Jugo the secretary.

The Antiquity of Man and Pre-Historic Times.—We have received from Sir Charles Lyell proofs of some pages of the new edition of his “Antiquity of Man,” which relate to a matter touched upon in a review of Sir John Lubbock’s “Pre-historic Times,” in the October number of the *Anthropological Review*, p. 388. The following remarks are made by Sir C. Lyell at the close of his preface, after mention of the authorities on whom he principally relied in describing the Danish shell-mounds:—“It was impossible for me, with the aid of such able investigators, to overlook any of the most striking discoveries and conclusions which had been made before 1860; but I gladly took advantage of the later numbers of Keller’s ‘Pfahlbauten,’ and of Mr. Lubbock’s ‘Memoir on the Danish Kjökkenmöddings,’ printed in the October number of the ‘Natural History Review’ for 1861, to improve the wording, and occasionally the subject-matter, of certain passages for which M. Morlot had already supplied the principal data. I had no space, without disturbing my type, for entering on a single new field of inquiry, or any new deductions furnished by Messrs. Keller, Lubbock, or other writers. Had I attempted to do justice to them, or to any authors of later date than the summer of 1860, I must have expanded the plan of my whole book, and seriously delayed the publication of the first edition, as well as of the subsequent issues.” In a note later on, mention is also made of Sir J. Lubbock’s paper in the “Natural History Review” for October 1861:—“Mr. John Lubbock published in the October number of the ‘Natural History Review,’ 1861, p. 489, an able paper on the Danish ‘shell-mounds,’ in which he has described the results of a recent visit to Denmark, made by him in company with Mr. Busk.”

The facts of the case may be profitably stated to show how such misunderstandings may arise. It seems that Sir Charles Lyell drew up his account before Sir J. Lubbock’s paper in the “Natural History Review” was written, and when it appeared he inserted a note to the effect that he had been unable to make use of it. In giving the finishing touches to his proofs, however, he afterwards did make use of it to some slight extent, but inadvertently left standing the note which had now become incorrect. Upon this, Sir J. Lubbock rejoined in the preface to his “Pre-historic Times,” in the passage our review commented upon. But we understand that on becoming aware of the real state of the case, he had this note cancelled, so that only the first few copies of his work were issued with it.

Our review was written with no wish to take the side of either of the two eminent scientific men who had unfortunately come into collision, but spoke in the interest of the readers of both, and we are happy to find that the whole discussion arose out of a mere oversight, and has been set right in a friendly spirit.
